

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Alexandria Division

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,)
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
v.) Civil Action No. 1:23cv0108 (LMB/JFA)
)
GOOGLE LLC,)
)
Defendant.)

ORDER

On June 13, 2025, plaintiffs filed a motion for leave to file under seal appendix A and exhibits 4 and 6–11 to plaintiffs’ memorandum in support of motion to enforce the court’s May 30 order and to compel production of defendant’s remedy feasibility submissions to the European Commission, as well as portions of the memorandum in support of the motion. (Docket no. 1479). In the memorandum in support of the motion to seal, plaintiffs state that the information sought to be sealed is based on defendant designating that information as confidential. (Docket no. 1480). Defendant has filed a response to the motion to seal. (Docket no. 1506). No other person or entity has filed a response or objection to this motion to seal.

Defendant’s response seeks to have only the information redacted on pages 2 and 10–12 of plaintiffs’ memorandum in support of their motion to remain under seal. Defendant requests that exhibits 4 and 7–11 remain under seal stating that the information in those documents contains attorney work product and non-public, commercially sensitive information. Defendant has filed a redacted version of appendix A (privilege log) in the public record in which only the names of Google employees are redacted. Finally, defendant has filed a redacted version of

exhibit 6 in the public record in which only one sentence is redacted that contains information related to settlement discussions.

This motion to seal concerns materials submitted to the court for review on a motion to compel and therefore any information to be filed under seal must satisfy the “common law” standard discussed in *Va. Dep’t of State Police v. Wash. Post*, 386 F.3d 567, 575 (4th Cir. 2004). Having reviewed plaintiffs’ memorandum in support of their motion to compel and the appendix and exhibits attached to that memorandum, it appears that the information specified by defendant in its response contains non-public, confidential information of a sensitive nature and certain personal information of some of defendant’s employees. Accordingly, the court finds that for **the purposes of this motion**, that information may remain under seal at this time. For these reasons, it is hereby

ORDERED that the motion to seal is granted in part and denied in part. The court finds that the information that was redacted on pages 2 and 10–12 of plaintiffs’ memorandum in support of their motion to compel should remain under seal. Plaintiffs shall file in the public record a version of their memorandum that includes the information that had previously been redacted on pages 5, 8, 9, and 14. The court also finds that exhibits 4 and 7–11 shall remain under seal. Finally, the court finds that the redactions proposed by defendant in appendix A and exhibit 6 are appropriate and that redacted versions of those exhibits have been filed in the public record by defendant.

Entered this 24th day of June, 2025.

Alexandria, Virginia

/s/
John F. Anderson
United States Magistrate Judge
John F. Anderson
United States Magistrate Judge